

Evening Telegraph

WEDNESDAY, MAY 23, 1866.

About Financial Crises.

The history of all modern financial crises is one long tale, not of misplaced confidence, but of careless distrust. As a general rule, the convulsions which overturn the whole monetary world are not occasioned by any hollowness on the part of the capitalist, but by a timidity on the part of the depositor. It is important that this doctrine, cardinal yet simple, should be borne in mind, as by it much of the anxiety which will result from the crisis in London will be dispelled. Because Sir Morton Peto and Overend, Gurney & Co. have been ruined, and the whole financial world stands waiting with trembling for new developments of losses, there is no cause for supposing that there is any radical defect in the system of monetary transactions. There is no cause for the fear of Sir Morton's depositors becoming infectious, nor is there any occasion for extended anxiety. The truth is that those who have been wrecked by the failure of these leading banking houses, have themselves and their fellow depositors to thank for whatever loss they may have sustained. The incidents of 1857 are of too recent occurrence for us to look with any wonder at the destruction of even such a colossal name as that of the British bank, so lately our guest. It seems that the customary alarm was felt, and, as usual, without just cause. A rush of men, each actuated by the meanest selfishness, to secure all his coin, even at the expense of a total loss on the part of his neighbor, took place. While Sir Morton Peto had millions of capital invested, yet his supply of funds on hand were not sufficient to meet the unexpected demand. The consequence was that financial paradox—a rich man, with millions of property, becoming insolvent. The great banker failed with twenty-five millions of dollars within reach of his hand in ten days. The cause was the inconsiderate greed and over-anxiety of his depositors; the result will probably be a sacrifice of what would otherwise have more than covered all besides the loss of time, a large proportion of their money, and the ruin of an established and universally respected house. There is but one lesson to be deduced from this incident. It ever there is a rush on a banking-house, try rather to diminish the thing than to add one more to its number. The probability is that if the excitement continues the house will fall, and a large percentage of your funds be lost; but if it ease off in time, eight chances out of ten that within two days you can draw your money in perfect quiet. Such a course is dictated not only by a sympathy for the banker, but also by self-interest and wisdom.

We have had parties asking indignantly, "Why do not the bankers keep money on hand to meet all demands?" It does not require long for the capitalist to know very nearly how much will be demanded of him as a daily average. If he keeps twice as much as this average on hand, that is all that any reasonable person can expect. If all the money be allowed to lay in the vaults of his establishment, where is he to make a living from? The banking business would be, come a species of universal charity, and the banker a receptacle for funds for which he would be responsible, but which he could not use. Any reasonable demand a firm house can stand, but there are rushes so wild and so general that the Bank of England could not withstand them. Speaking of the Bank of England reminds us of a certainly safe but not particularly intelligent preventive for such a catastrophe. The charter of the bank compels it to keep £10,000,000 in its vaults. So that this vast amount of gold is left from century to century lying idle in order to meet an anticipated demand which could be in all likelihood avoided under any circumstances. But such a course may be that of wisdom, although it compels the bank to charge a higher rate of discount, yet it gives a firmness to all its proceedings and renders the awful terrors of a failure of such an institution impossible.

One word more. The causes which have conspired to occasion this convulsion have been greatly augmented, if not originated, by the political uncertainty of the British empire. The excitement over the Reform bill, and the general decomposing incidents of a state of wild public feeling, have conspired to hasten this crisis. If Great Britain is thus subject to the effect of discussion in the money market, on what a volcano must we be quietly resting! If the present excitement in our political world continues, it cannot but produce a feeling of uneasiness and retard trade. We have seen its baneful influence already. All we can do, however, is to seek to be prepared for any danger, nor yield we cannot, and our adversities will not; hence safety to us lies in a confidence in the stability of our free institutions, and an abiding faith in the capability of man for self-government.

Secretary Seward's Significant Speech.

MR. SEWARD, according to his usual custom, has taken occasion on his recent visit to Auburn to deliver an utterance upon the topics of the hour. His speech is chiefly remarkable for its tone of conciliation between Congress and the President. He declares that they disagree only upon non-essentials. He thus groups their agreement upon what he calls the "only essentials." "The representatives of the National Union party in Congress do not agree with the President, but I think they differ only in regard to non-essentials. Some are understood to insist that the people of a State ought to have the right of secession or disunion. The President says exactly the same thing. A State that should insist upon the validity of such a claim would not be loyal. Others argue that as a consequence of the abolition of slavery a change of the us of representation has become desirable and necessary. This can be done only by amending the Constitution of the United States. While Congress are yet unable to agree among themselves upon the form of such an amendment, the President says:—'Let us amend the Constitution so as to proportion representation according to suffrage.' These seem to me to be the only essentials. Two of them are already secured by the unrepresented in their constitutions. The third is a work of time, requiring the action of three-fourths of the States, by amendment of the Constitution." It is especially noticeable here that Secretary Seward fully commits the President to the policy of an amendment of the Constitution upon the vital and all-important matter of an equalization of the basis of representation. He denies explicitly that President Johnson's "plan" is of his own origination, but says it grew up necessarily out of the unavoidable

predestined change from war to peace. And hence he significantly remarks:—

"Congress is to be expected, therefore, to concur with the President, not in adopting a plan which he has projected, but in adopting with him actually existing overtures of reconciliation in the form in which they have occurred. I think that the projected Congress hitherto indicate not an ultimate disagreement and failure, but only a procrastination, which to the impatient is inconvenient, and to the timid a warning."

These utterances of the astute Secretary, we may rest assured, are well considered, and have a purpose. They point unmistakably to a reconciliation between Congress and the President.

Equally in this line of thought are those subsequent passages of his speech where Mr. Seward so emphatically asserts the loyalty of those persons who may claim seats as members of that body. He avows that it may adopt any test or standard for determining that question which it may choose. He also alludes to the vetoes of the President, and says "all three of those measures in which the President declined to concur with Congress are purely extraneous incidents, and have no necessary or real bearing upon the question of reconciliation."

Mr. Seward sums up the whole matter in one of these hopeful bursts which are so characteristic of him as a political optimist:—

"I am hopeful of the President, hopeful of Congress, hopeful of the National Union party, hopeful of the Democratic party, hopeful of the represented and unrepresented States, hopeful of the whole people, and hopeful of the continued favor of Almighty God, when I shall return here from the field of public service, and shall come once more in your quiet and peaceful pursuits."

Probable Reunion of the Presbyterian Church.

THE news from St. Louis points to the probable reunion, at no distant period, of the Old and New School branches of the Presbyterian Church. The General Assemblies of both bodies are now in session at St. Louis, and for the first time since the rupture in 1837, they last night met together to discuss the subject of reunion.

It is unnecessary to go into the history of the causes which originally conspired to divide this great body of Christians. Differences of doctrinal opinion, exaggerated far out of their legitimate importance, did something; the ambition and overbearing temper of a few leading spirits did more. After the division had once been made, pride of opinion, personal resentments, and a gradually diverging tendency of opinion between the two bodies upon the subject of slavery—that great ploughshare of political and ecclesiastical division—served to keep them apart. So it has been for thirty years. A generation has passed away, and the passions and resentments aroused by the original rupture have passed away also. Slavery, too, has gone out of existence in the darkness of attempted revolution.

The doctrinal differences were always characteristic of individuals, rather than of the bodies themselves. Nothing now stands in the way of a reunion of the great Presbyterian family. The people are almost unanimous for it. Reunited, the Church would be one of the most powerful of the land in numbers, wealth, and influence. Its home and foreign missionary operations, its church erection and publication enterprises, its colleges and theological seminaries, could be consolidated, enlarged, and prosecuted with increased capital and efficiency, and with greatly augmented results. We trust that so desirable a consummation may not be far distant. It will be a signal for that general reunion of organizations once severed and kept apart by slavery, which all must long to see.

Senator Wilson's Bill for Equalizing Soldiers' Bounties.

THERE is no topic upon which a more complete unanimity exists among all our Union soldiers than upon that of a fair and just equalization of bounties. It is well known that the thousands and tens of thousands of gallant men who rushed to the field at the earlier calls of the Government, did so without the stimulus of bounties. At a later period high bounties were paid both by the general Government and by the States, and in many instances by cities and counties also. Justice requires that the early soldier who went voluntarily to the field unincited by the hope of pecuniary reward, shall not now be forgotten by his country.

Senator Wilson's bill, reported to the Senate yesterday, goes upon the simple principle of paying to every Union soldier, sailor, and marine of the late war, a bounty of eight and a half dollars per month for the time he was in service, deducting therefrom any bounty or prize money he may already have received or be entitled to. It is estimated that it will require the sum of one hundred and eighty-five millions of dollars to pay these bounties.

We regard this as a sacred debt, due in all honor and honesty to the men who saved the country in its hour of supreme peril; and we trust that Senator Wilson's bill will pass.

PASSED AT LAST.—At every session since the organization of the Republican party, an effort has been made to secure the passage of a general Bankrupt Law. It seems that the Representative of Rhode Island has made this bill his specialty, as each successor has taken the interest left by the former occupant of his seat upon himself, and pressed the claims of the bill. It has been universally defeated by a vote of not more than twelve majority against it. Yesterday the persistent efforts of Mr. Jencks were rewarded with success, and the bill passed by a majority of nine. Its principal provision is that any debtor, whose liabilities exceed three hundred dollars, may come before a United States District Court, swear to his inability to pay, and surrender all his estate into the hands of an assignee. If in after years he acquires property, that property cannot be seized by his former creditors. It virtually removes the load from an insolvent debtor, and gives him an incentive to energy and hope for future success.

A CATHEDRAL DOOMED.—The Berlin Cathedral is doomed to destruction within two years. A much larger cathedral, according to plans approved by the late King, is to be built on the same site.

LEGAL INTELLIGENCE.

EVIDENCE OF TRANSFER OF STOCK.

Supreme Court of Pennsylvania—Chief Justice Woodward, and Justices Thompson, Strong, Kead, and Agnew.

The following opinion is one of great interest to the mercantile community, involving as it does, the question of the right of a bona fide purchaser to demand evidence of authority in a trustee to make a transfer of stock, and the rights of the stockholder, delivered by Judge S. Romig, is as follows:—

Boyd v. The Farmers' and Mechanics' Bank of Strasburg, J.—Passing by the question whether the defendants, being mere agents of the Commonwealth, are liable to damages at the suit of the plaintiff, even for a wrongful refusal to consent to a transfer of the stock, we come immediately to the inquiry whether the refusal was wrongful. Certainly the plaintiff has a right to demand a transfer, if their permission would have exposed them or their principals to a successful claim by any one for the replacement of the stock or for its proceeds, and if the defendant were custodian of the rights of stockowners. With them was the registry, and transfers could be made only with their consent, by the surrender of the certificates and the issue of new ones to the bona fide purchaser of stock does not receive the certificate of his vendor, but a new one made out in his own name, and being so indistinguishable from the former, it is therefore protected in the enjoyment of a purchase, even though there was no right in the transfer to him. For this reason an unauthorized transfer of a wrong doing is a waiver of stock, for which not only the person who makes it, but any one knowingly assisting in the wrong, are liable to a bona fide purchaser, for a certain extent for stockholders, that is, for the protection of individual interests, cannot be denied. They are able to acquire and transfer the title of each owner. They have in their keeping the primary evidence of title, and they are justly held responsible for the delivery of the certificates. From this it results that they may, without a demand of authority to make a transfer, before they permit it to be made. Their own safety requires that they should not permit a person proposing to make a transfer to do what he proposes, generally sufficient evidence of such a right is found in the possession of legal title to the stock, or its receipt, and a bona fide purchase, sufficient. Notwithstanding that, the true equitable ownership may be in some other than the holder of the certificate, and it is necessary to bring to such an equitable owner, for the holder of a corporation, or keepers of the registry, make themselves parties, it, with knowledge that there is no equitable right to transfer, they permit it to be done.

And in equity whatever puts a party upon inquiry is notice of what may be true. The rule, therefore, in determining how far is to be extended the transfer agent to inquire. The law casts the legal ownership of personal property of a deceased individual upon his executor, and it is his duty to administer the estate, and to see that the primary duty always to dispose of the personal property, and thereafter pay the debts of the decedent, and to distribute among his next of kin. A sale and transfer of stocks by them is therefore in the line of their duty. There is no such thing as a bona fide purchase of such a transfer. Hence, the executor's administration are always sufficient evidence of authority. A trustee of an insolvent debtor would seem to stand in a similar position, and his duty is to administer the estate, and to see that the primary duty always to dispose of the personal property, and thereafter pay the debts of the decedent, and to distribute among his next of kin. A sale and transfer of stocks by them is therefore in the line of their duty. There is no such thing as a bona fide purchase of such a transfer. Hence, the executor's administration are always sufficient evidence of authority.

And in equity whatever puts a party upon inquiry is notice of what may be true. The rule, therefore, in determining how far is to be extended the transfer agent to inquire. The law casts the legal ownership of personal property of a deceased individual upon his executor, and it is his duty to administer the estate, and to see that the primary duty always to dispose of the personal property, and thereafter pay the debts of the decedent, and to distribute among his next of kin. A sale and transfer of stocks by them is therefore in the line of their duty. There is no such thing as a bona fide purchase of such a transfer. Hence, the executor's administration are always sufficient evidence of authority.

And in equity whatever puts a party upon inquiry is notice of what may be true. The rule, therefore, in determining how far is to be extended the transfer agent to inquire. The law casts the legal ownership of personal property of a deceased individual upon his executor, and it is his duty to administer the estate, and to see that the primary duty always to dispose of the personal property, and thereafter pay the debts of the decedent, and to distribute among his next of kin. A sale and transfer of stocks by them is therefore in the line of their duty. There is no such thing as a bona fide purchase of such a transfer. Hence, the executor's administration are always sufficient evidence of authority.

And in equity whatever puts a party upon inquiry is notice of what may be true. The rule, therefore, in determining how far is to be extended the transfer agent to inquire. The law casts the legal ownership of personal property of a deceased individual upon his executor, and it is his duty to administer the estate, and to see that the primary duty always to dispose of the personal property, and thereafter pay the debts of the decedent, and to distribute among his next of kin. A sale and transfer of stocks by them is therefore in the line of their duty. There is no such thing as a bona fide purchase of such a transfer. Hence, the executor's administration are always sufficient evidence of authority.

And in equity whatever puts a party upon inquiry is notice of what may be true. The rule, therefore, in determining how far is to be extended the transfer agent to inquire. The law casts the legal ownership of personal property of a deceased individual upon his executor, and it is his duty to administer the estate, and to see that the primary duty always to dispose of the personal property, and thereafter pay the debts of the decedent, and to distribute among his next of kin. A sale and transfer of stocks by them is therefore in the line of their duty. There is no such thing as a bona fide purchase of such a transfer. Hence, the executor's administration are always sufficient evidence of authority.

And in equity whatever puts a party upon inquiry is notice of what may be true. The rule, therefore, in determining how far is to be extended the transfer agent to inquire. The law casts the legal ownership of personal property of a deceased individual upon his executor, and it is his duty to administer the estate, and to see that the primary duty always to dispose of the personal property, and thereafter pay the debts of the decedent, and to distribute among his next of kin. A sale and transfer of stocks by them is therefore in the line of their duty. There is no such thing as a bona fide purchase of such a transfer. Hence, the executor's administration are always sufficient evidence of authority.

And in equity whatever puts a party upon inquiry is notice of what may be true. The rule, therefore, in determining how far is to be extended the transfer agent to inquire. The law casts the legal ownership of personal property of a deceased individual upon his executor, and it is his duty to administer the estate, and to see that the primary duty always to dispose of the personal property, and thereafter pay the debts of the decedent, and to distribute among his next of kin. A sale and transfer of stocks by them is therefore in the line of their duty. There is no such thing as a bona fide purchase of such a transfer. Hence, the executor's administration are always sufficient evidence of authority.

And in equity whatever puts a party upon inquiry is notice of what may be true. The rule, therefore, in determining how far is to be extended the transfer agent to inquire. The law casts the legal ownership of personal property of a deceased individual upon his executor, and it is his duty to administer the estate, and to see that the primary duty always to dispose of the personal property, and thereafter pay the debts of the decedent, and to distribute among his next of kin. A sale and transfer of stocks by them is therefore in the line of their duty. There is no such thing as a bona fide purchase of such a transfer. Hence, the executor's administration are always sufficient evidence of authority.

And in equity whatever puts a party upon inquiry is notice of what may be true. The rule, therefore, in determining how far is to be extended the transfer agent to inquire. The law casts the legal ownership of personal property of a deceased individual upon his executor, and it is his duty to administer the estate, and to see that the primary duty always to dispose of the personal property, and thereafter pay the debts of the decedent, and to distribute among his next of kin. A sale and transfer of stocks by them is therefore in the line of their duty. There is no such thing as a bona fide purchase of such a transfer. Hence, the executor's administration are always sufficient evidence of authority.

And in equity whatever puts a party upon inquiry is notice of what may be true. The rule, therefore, in determining how far is to be extended the transfer agent to inquire. The law casts the legal ownership of personal property of a deceased individual upon his executor, and it is his duty to administer the estate, and to see that the primary duty always to dispose of the personal property, and thereafter pay the debts of the decedent, and to distribute among his next of kin. A sale and transfer of stocks by them is therefore in the line of their duty. There is no such thing as a bona fide purchase of such a transfer. Hence, the executor's administration are always sufficient evidence of authority.

there is no case in which it has been ruled that a trustee of stock, whose certificate shows a declared trust for another named, has a right to transfer it, without showing a power beyond his certificate. It has been decided that a corporation may disregard the rights of a known equitable stockholder. It would be an anomaly were there any such decision. An officer in a bond must take notice of the rights of an equitable owner, and a stakeholder cannot safely pay over to him who has the legal right when he knows another to be the equitable owner. With a view to the interests of the community, it is held that a trustee, in order to aid in destroying the title of a certain trust to its stock, without being satisfied that the trustee has authority to pay, may and do so, and he holds, therefore, that the plaintiff had no right to insist upon being allowed to make a transfer of stock which he held ostensibly in trust for Mary Gilpin, without exhibiting to the defendants an authority to transfer, beyond the certificates. The judgment is affirmed.

United States District Court.—Judge Cadwalader.—Daniel A. Yeager was put on trial yesterday, charged with forcing a power of attorney, with intent to defraud the Government. It was alleged that the defendant forwarded to Washington, a power of attorney purporting to be drawn by William Matthews who claimed \$200 as due to him for services as Master of Ambulance. The claim was suspected at Washington, and papers were prepared with a view to the arrest of the party forwarding the same. The defendant, in order to avoid arrest, directed to William Matthews, informing him that the money was to be sent by Adams Express.

A Government detective came to Philadelphia and watched at the express office until the defendant presented himself with the letter directed to William Matthews. The package was given to the defendant, and he was arrested. The defendant set up good character, and contended that there was no evidence that the defendant had forged the power of attorney to recover damages for the loss of the property. The jury this morning returned a verdict of guilty. Augustus King and Lawrence King were put on trial this morning, charged with making counterfeit iron and copper coins, and with the possession of the same. In random street, the officers who made the arrest found a large quantity of counterfeit silver and gold coins, and a quantity of bank-note paper and gold leaf. On trial.

District Court No. 1.—Judge Haro.—William Harby vs. The Germantown Passenger Railway Company. An action to recover damages for injuries sustained by plaintiff through the alleged misconduct of a conductor of one of the cars of the company, defendant. Before reported. After the plaintiff's case closed, yesterday, the Court directed a nonsuit to be entered.

Frederick Fisher vs. The Connecting Railroad Company. An action to recover damages for the loss sustained by the plaintiff by reason of the location of the line of defendant's railroad through his farm, in the defendant's yard, where his crops were destroyed. The defense set up was that the land had been purchased from the owner of the land—the landowner of plaintiff—and that he had received notice thereof three months before the expiration of his year, and before they had located their line. On trial.

District Court No. 2.—Judge Stroud.—William R. White vs. Thomas D. Ingham. An action to recover damages for the alleged breach of contract for the conveyance of a certain house and lot, which was destroyed by fire. The defendant set up that the house was purchased from the owner of the land—the landowner of plaintiff—and that he had received notice thereof three months before the expiration of his year, and before they had located their line. On trial.

District Court No. 2.—Judge Stroud.—William R. White vs. Thomas D. Ingham. An action to recover damages for the alleged breach of contract for the conveyance of a certain house and lot, which was destroyed by fire. The defendant set up that the house was purchased from the owner of the land—the landowner of plaintiff—and that he had received notice thereof three months before the expiration of his year, and before they had located their line. On trial.

District Court No. 2.—Judge Stroud.—William R. White vs. Thomas D. Ingham. An action to recover damages for the alleged breach of contract for the conveyance of a certain house and lot, which was destroyed by fire. The defendant set up that the house was purchased from the owner of the land—the landowner of plaintiff—and that he had received notice thereof three months before the expiration of his year, and before they had located their line. On trial.

District Court No. 2.—Judge Stroud.—William R. White vs. Thomas D. Ingham. An action to recover damages for the alleged breach of contract for the conveyance of a certain house and lot, which was destroyed by fire. The defendant set up that the house was purchased from the owner of the land—the landowner of plaintiff—and that he had received notice thereof three months before the expiration of his year, and before they had located their line. On trial.

District Court No. 2.—Judge Stroud.—William R. White vs. Thomas D. Ingham. An action to recover damages for the alleged breach of contract for the conveyance of a certain house and lot, which was destroyed by fire. The defendant set up that the house was purchased from the owner of the land—the landowner of plaintiff—and that he had received notice thereof three months before the expiration of his year, and before they had located their line. On trial.

District Court No. 2.—Judge Stroud.—William R. White vs. Thomas D. Ingham. An action to recover damages for the alleged breach of contract for the conveyance of a certain house and lot, which was destroyed by fire. The defendant set up that the house was purchased from the owner of the land—the landowner of plaintiff—and that he had received notice thereof three months before the expiration of his year, and before they had located their line. On trial.

District Court No. 2.—Judge Stroud.—William R. White vs. Thomas D. Ingham. An action to recover damages for the alleged breach of contract for the conveyance of a certain house and lot, which was destroyed by fire. The defendant set up that the house was purchased from the owner of the land—the landowner of plaintiff—and that he had received notice thereof three months before the expiration of his year, and before they had located their line. On trial.

District Court No. 2.—Judge Stroud.—William R. White vs. Thomas D. Ingham. An action to recover damages for the alleged breach of contract for the conveyance of a certain house and lot, which was destroyed by fire. The defendant set up that the house was purchased from the owner of the land—the landowner of plaintiff—and that he had received notice thereof three months before the expiration of his year, and before they had located their line. On trial.

District Court No. 2.—Judge Stroud.—William R. White vs. Thomas D. Ingham. An action to recover damages for the alleged breach of contract for the conveyance of a certain house and lot, which was destroyed by fire. The defendant set up that the house was purchased from the owner of the land—the landowner of plaintiff—and that he had received notice thereof three months before the expiration of his year, and before they had located their line. On trial.

District Court No. 2.—Judge Stroud.—William R. White vs. Thomas D. Ingham. An action to recover damages for the alleged breach of contract for the conveyance of a certain house and lot, which was destroyed by fire. The defendant set up that the house was purchased from the owner of the land—the landowner of plaintiff—and that he had received notice thereof three months before the expiration of his year, and before they had located their line. On trial.

District Court No. 2.—Judge Stroud.—William R. White vs. Thomas D. Ingham. An action to recover damages for the alleged breach of contract for the conveyance of a certain house and lot, which was destroyed by fire. The defendant set up that the house was purchased from the owner of the land—the landowner of plaintiff—and that he had received notice thereof three months before the expiration of his year, and before they had located their line. On trial.

District Court No. 2.—Judge Stroud.—William R. White vs. Thomas D. Ingham. An action to recover damages for the alleged breach of contract for the conveyance of a certain house and lot, which was destroyed by fire. The defendant set up that the house was purchased from the owner of the land—the landowner of plaintiff—and that he had received notice thereof three months before the expiration of his year, and before they had located their line. On trial.

District Court No. 2.—Judge Stroud.—William R. White vs. Thomas D. Ingham. An action to recover damages for the alleged breach of contract for the conveyance of a certain house and lot, which was destroyed by fire. The defendant set up that the house was purchased from the owner of the land—the landowner of plaintiff—and that he had received notice thereof three months before the expiration of his year, and before they had located their line. On trial.

District Court No. 2.—Judge Stroud.—William R. White vs. Thomas D. Ingham. An action to recover damages for the alleged breach of contract for the conveyance of a certain house and lot, which was destroyed by fire. The defendant set up that the house was purchased from the owner of the land—the landowner of plaintiff—and that he had received notice thereof three months before the expiration of his year, and before they had located their line. On trial.

District Court No. 2.—Judge Stroud.—William R. White vs. Thomas D. Ingham. An action to recover damages for the alleged breach of contract for the conveyance of a certain house and lot, which was destroyed by fire. The defendant set up that the house was purchased from the owner of the land—the landowner of plaintiff—and that he had received notice thereof three months before the expiration of his year, and before they had located their line. On trial.

District Court No. 2.—Judge Stroud.—William R. White vs. Thomas D. Ingham. An action to recover damages for the alleged breach of contract for the conveyance of a certain house and lot, which was destroyed by fire. The defendant set up that the house was purchased from the owner of the land—the landowner of plaintiff—and that he had received notice thereof three months before the expiration of his year, and before they had located their line. On trial.

District Court No. 2.—Judge Stroud.—William R. White vs. Thomas D. Ingham. An action to recover damages for the alleged breach of contract for the conveyance of a certain house and lot, which was destroyed by fire. The defendant set up that the house was purchased from the owner of the land—the landowner of plaintiff—and that he had received notice thereof three months before the expiration of his year, and before they had located their line. On trial.

District Court No. 2.—Judge Stroud.—William R. White vs. Thomas D. Ingham. An action to recover damages for the alleged breach of contract for the conveyance of a certain house and lot, which was destroyed by fire. The defendant set up that the house was purchased from the owner of the land—the landowner of plaintiff—and that he had received notice thereof three months before the expiration of his year, and before they had located their line. On trial.

District Court No. 2.—Judge Stroud.—William R. White vs. Thomas D. Ingham. An action to recover damages for the alleged breach of contract for the conveyance of a certain house and lot, which was destroyed by fire. The defendant set up that the house was purchased from the owner of the land—the landowner of plaintiff—and that he had received notice thereof three months before the expiration of his year, and before they had located their line. On trial.

District Court No. 2.—Judge Stroud.—William R. White vs. Thomas D. Ingham. An action to recover damages for the alleged breach of contract for the conveyance of a certain house and lot, which was destroyed by fire. The defendant set up that the house was purchased from the owner of the land—the landowner of plaintiff—and that he had received notice thereof three months before the expiration of his year, and before they had located their line. On trial.

District Court No. 2.—Judge Stroud.—William R. White vs. Thomas D. Ingham. An action to recover damages for the alleged breach of contract for the conveyance of a certain house and lot, which was destroyed by fire. The defendant set up that the house was purchased from the owner of the land—the landowner of plaintiff—and that he had received notice thereof three months before the expiration of his year, and before they had located their line. On trial.

District Court No. 2.—Judge Stroud.—William R. White vs. Thomas D. Ingham. An action to recover damages for the alleged breach of contract for the conveyance of a certain house and lot, which was destroyed by fire. The defendant set up that the house was purchased from the owner of the land—the landowner of plaintiff—and that he had received notice thereof three months before the expiration of his year, and before they had located their line. On trial.

District Court No. 2.—Judge Stroud.—William R. White vs. Thomas D. Ingham. An action to recover damages for the alleged breach of contract for the conveyance of a certain house and lot, which was destroyed by fire. The defendant set up that the house was purchased from the owner of the land—the landowner of plaintiff—and that he had received notice thereof three months before the expiration of his year, and before they had located their line. On trial.

District Court No. 2.—Judge Stroud.—William R. White vs. Thomas D. Ingham. An action to recover damages for the alleged breach of contract for the conveyance of a certain house and lot, which was destroyed by fire. The defendant set up that the house was purchased from the owner of the land—the landowner of plaintiff—and that he had received notice thereof three months before the expiration of his year, and before they had located their line. On trial.

SPECIAL NOTICES.

(See the Third Page for additional Special Notices.)

THE FORTY-SECOND ANNIVERSARY of the American Sunday School Union will be celebrated at the ACADEMY OF MUSIC, Broad Street, on Thursday Evening, May 24, at a quarter to 8 o'clock. His Chief Justice CHASE will preside. Addresses will be delivered by Rev. D. W. CHIDLOW, Rev. JOHN S. LAGH, and others. The singing will be by a choir of six hundred children from our various Sunday Schools. Parties who may have tickets and do not intend using the same will confer a favor by returning them to the Secretary's Hall, No. 112 Chestnut Street. All reserved seats unoccupied at 8 o'clock will be thrown open to standees. 5 21 31

THE REV. HENRY CLAY TRUMBULL (formerly Chaplain in the Army of the James) will speak at the Forty-second Anniversary of the American Sunday School Union, at the ACADEMY OF MUSIC, on THURSDAY EVENING, 5 21 31

OFFICE OF THE LEHIGH COAL AND NAVIGATION COMPANY. The Board of Managers have this day declared a dividend of FIVE PER CENT, or TWO DOLLARS AND A HALF PER SHARE, on the capital stock of this Company, payable on demand, near of national and State Treasurers.

All persons who have not a ready done so are earnestly requested to present at this office their certificates of stock or receipts for the same, and the capital stock of this Company issued in 1855, and receive their certificates of stock in lieu thereof. SOLOMON SHEPHERD, Treasurer.

OFFICE OF THE PLUMLEY FARM AND LONG RUN OIL AND COAL MINING COMPANY, No. 619 WALNUT STREET. Notice is hereby given to all Stockholders of the above Company who have failed to pay the assessment of Ten Cents per share on the number of shares to their credit on or before the 22nd inst., that the stock shall be made, that unless the same shall be paid to the Treasurer on or before the 22nd inst., the stock shall be advertised for sale together with the name of each Stockholder making default. JAMES MCUTCHEON, Treasurer, 5 21 31

Philadelphia, May 23, 1866.

NOTICE. ADAMS EXPRESS COMPANY. On and after TUESDAY, May 1, the FREIGHT DEPARTMENT of this Company will be removed to the "Company's" New Building, No. 112 Chestnut Street, and all calls entered therein previous to 5 P. M. will receive attention same as heretofore. Inquiries for goods and settlements to be made at No. 320 CHESTNUT STREET. JAMES MCUTCHEON, Superintendent, 5 21 31

OIL STOCKS WANTED.—A PARTY having \$100,000 to dispose of, and desiring to give true names name of Company, DEANIS, Post Office Box No 1318, Philadelphia 5 21 31

THE MISSES THORNHILL & BURNS, No. 1208 CHESTNUT STREET. Have just received, WELLEY COBSETS. In all the latest styles. BRADLEY'S DUPLEX ELASTIC KIRTS. In all the latest styles. FRENCH IMPORTED DRESSING SAQUES, AND MADE-UP UNDER GARMENTS FOR LADIES. And a fine assortment of PRINTED LINEN LAWS, FOR DRESSES, AT 50 CENTS PER YARD. (5 21 31) Wm. F. SCHOMACKER PIANO FORT MANUFACTURING COMPANY'S NEW STORE, No. 1108 CHESTNUT STREET.—We respectfully call the attention of our friends and the public generally of our removal to our new and handsome Warehouses, GIBBARD ROW, No. 1108 CHESTNUT STREET, where we have constantly on hand a large stock of our superior and highly finished Square and Grand Pianos. Our instruments have been awarded the highest premiums at all the principal exhibitions ever held in this country, with numerous testimonials from the first-class artists in America and Europe. They are now the leading Pianos and are sold to all parts of the world. Persons desiring to purchase a first-class Piano at greatly reduced rates should not fail to give us a call. Pianos to rent—Tuning and repairs—completely attended to. SCHOMACKER & CO., No. 1108 CHESTNUT STREET.

CONCERT HALL.—The Harmon Troupe will give a matinee, at which The Bohemian Girl will be played. In the evening, The Child of the Regiment.

ASSEMBLY BUILDINGS.—The Carolina Twins are attracting crowds. The scientific as well as the curious are desirous of viewing these extraordinary girls.

A GRANT RADISH.—The Pall Mall Gazette says:—The last new thing in vegetables is really quite a startling wonder. This is a radish with seedpods about three feet long, and sometimes growing five or six inches in four-and-twenty hours. We can think of nothing like it except Jack's immortal beanstalk, which, although described as plant is nevertheless not spoken of as a root to eat, whereas this radish is said to be as palatable as it is monstrous. The plant comes from Java, but we are told that it has been fairly tried in the open ground in England, and succeeds perfectly well. To add to its merits, its pods are ready for use in less than three months after the seed is sown.

WALNUT STREET THEATRE.—Hamlet at this theatre. All who have not seen this fine artistic production should not delay, as it will not be played many more times.

ALICE STREET THEATRE.—Miss Lucy Rubston will give a matinee, in the Honeymoon, which will be given twice.

CONCERT HALL.—The Harmon Troupe will give a matinee, at which The Bohemian Girl will be played. In the evening, The Child of the Regiment.

ASSEMBLY BUILDINGS.—The Carolina Twins are attracting crowds. The scientific as well as the curious are desirous of viewing these extraordinary girls.

A GRANT RADISH.—The Pall Mall Gazette says:—The last new thing in vegetables is really quite a startling wonder. This is a radish with seedpods about three feet long, and sometimes growing five or six inches in four-and-twenty hours. We can think of nothing like it except Jack's immortal beanstalk, which, although described as plant is nevertheless not spoken of as a root to eat, whereas this radish is said to be as palatable as it is monstrous. The plant comes from Java, but we are told that it has been fairly tried in the open ground in England, and succeeds perfectly well. To add to its merits, its pods are ready for use in less than three months after the seed is sown.

WALNUT STREET THEATRE.—Hamlet at this theatre. All who have not seen this fine artistic production should not delay, as it will not be played many more times.

ALICE STREET THEATRE.—Miss Lucy Rubston will give a matinee, in the Honeymoon, which will be given twice.